



Supplemental Education Services
Annual Evaluation Report
2007-2008

Prepared by:

John J. Usera, Ph. D.
Institute for Educational Leadership & Evaluation®
Chiesman Center for Democracy, Inc.
1641 Deadwood Avenue
Rapid City, SD 57702



Table of Contents

Overview 3

Guiding Questions for Evaluating SES Providers 4

Methodology 5

 Effectiveness Measures 5

 Customer Satisfaction Measures 6

Findings 7

 Demographic Profile 7

 Monitoring 20

 Provider Questionnaire Results 26

 Classroom Teacher Questionnaire Results 28

 Parent Questionnaire Results 32

Conclusion 34

Recommendations 36

Overview

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires local education agencies (LEA) to provide supplemental education services to low income students when the LEA has reached Level II of school improvement. Title I, Section 1116(e) explains that supplemental education services (SES) are “additional instruction designed to increase the academic achievement of students in schools in need of improvement. These services may include academic assistance such as tutoring, remediation, and other educational interventions...”

Supplemental educational services are provided outside of the regular school day to increase student achievement and may include assistance such as tutoring, remediation, and other academic interventions. Parents of eligible students may obtain these services from their child free of charge from an approved SES provider of their choice. The South Dakota Department of Education are responsible for approving SES providers and providing local districts with a list of the approved providers serving the area.¹

South Dakota Department of Education (DOE) issued a request for proposals for agencies to provide supplemental education services (Appendix A) in April of 2007. The proposal submission deadline was May 15, 2007. The applications were reviewed based on several criteria. These included a description of the program, staffing, research and program effectiveness, assessment and monitoring of students, and financial and organizational capacity. The provide was asked to show evidence that the program is aligned to the state standards in reading and mathematics.

Once the SES provider had successfully completed the request for proposal and successfully completed the review process, then the provider was placed on the DOE approved provider list. The local educational agency (LEA) is required then to notify parents when the LEA has reached Level II of school improvement and offer

¹ U.S. Department of Education (2007). *Giving parents options: Strategies for informing parents and implementing public school choice and supplemental education services under no child left behind*. Washington, D.C.: Author, Office of Innovation and Improvement.

supplemental education services. Parents may elect to have their child participate. Upon receipt of acceptance for supplemental education services, the LEA contacts the SES providers and services are contracted for the child. The services are paid by the LEA through allocated Title I funds. The services are provided before or after school. Depending on the provider, services may be implemented in the school or home.

The purpose of this report is to provide data and information regarding the implementation of supplemental education services in South Dakota during the 2007-08 school year. For the reporting period, there were 14 providers approved in South Dakota. The providers ranged from computer-based programs to tutoring and mentoring. The Institute for Educational Leadership and Evaluation® (IELE), a project of the Chiesman Center for Democracy, Inc., was commissioned to conduct the review of the SES proposals and to monitor and evaluate the SES providers for the 2007-08 school year.

Guiding Questions For Evaluating SES Providers

To effectively monitor SES providers, the South Dakota Department of Education in collaboration with the Institute for Educational Leadership & Evaluation, develop a set of guiding questions and protocol to measure the impact of the SES provider's services. There were three major questions asked:

1. Did the provider increase student achievement in reading, language arts, and mathematics? [Effectiveness]
2. Are parents of students who receive SES satisfied? [Satisfaction]
3. Did the provider comply with applicable South Dakota and district laws and contractual procedures associated with the delivery of SES? [Compliance]

The providers were informed of the expectation to demonstrate effectiveness of their respective programs in serving all types of students including English language learners (ELL) and students with special needs and disabilities. Depending upon the specific locations, delivery methodologies, and resources, the providers were expected to provide information and data about:

1. Tutors' experience and qualifications;
2. The amount of tutoring time students received;
3. The individualized instructional strategies used;
4. Instructor to student ratios and grouping formats;
5. Communication protocols with parents and teachers;
6. Promised transportation of students to and from tutoring; and
7. Promised materials and support systems for the students.

Methodology

Effectiveness Measures

Measures of impact on student academic achievement are critical to a state's evaluation of SES providers. This is especially true because the No Child Left Behind Act requires that, a minimum, states remove providers from their approved list if the provider fails to increase students' achievement for two consecutive years.² Data was collected using the Dakota Step to measure annual progress in the areas of reading and mathematics in addition to supplementary individualized assessments, and provider developed assessments to document improved academic achievement.

Pretest and posttest scores were collected to measure changes in achievement. The pretest scores served as a guide for developing individualized instructional strategies

² Ross, S., Potter, A. & Harmon, J. (2006). *Evaluating supplemental education service providers: Suggested strategies for states*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Research in Educational Policy.

by the many of the providers. The validity and reliability of supplementary individualized assessments were monitored and substantiated by the providers when requested. Some of the supplementary assessments were administered at the school site, but in the majority of the cases it was administered during the tutoring period of instruction.

Provider developed assessments to measure student progress were used in conjunction with specific curriculum materials. The objectivity and validity of the scores could be compromised when the providers themselves were asked to administer and score the tests that would be used to judge the effectiveness of their inventions. For many of the providers, these tests served a diagnostic and formative role rather than a true assessment of achievement.

Customer Satisfaction Measures

Parents, families, and students are SES providers' most important customers. Teachers and school administrators were viewed as passive customers of the SES providers. The school it was important that program was satisfactory or excellent in helping students receiving quality services. To collect information on customer satisfaction regarding the SES providers the **Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS)**, a web-based survey system, was designed and implemented by South Dakota Department of Education. The CAS included a Local Education Agency Questionnaire, Provider Questionnaire, Teacher Questionnaire, Principal Questionnaire, and Parent Questionnaire

All the providers and the schools were contacted to complete the CAS questionnaires and provide documentation and logs regarding the students served. Field monitors reported the quality and status of the implementation of services by the providers.

Findings

Demographic Profile

Data was collected by the South Dakota Department of Education on 227 students during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years. In 2006-07 school year, data was available for 313 students. In 2007-08 school year data was available for 467 students, an increase of 49.2% from the previous year. Students who were enrolled in any SES provider's program were tracked using their Student Identification Membership number (SIMS). Data included assessment scores from the Dakota STEP state assessment and the providers' assessments. In the 2007-08 school year, data was collected from 30 schools located in 12 school districts.

Table 1.0 shows the distribution of reports and surveys returned to the South Dakota Department of Education. There were 5,758 eligible students from the reporting school districts for supplemental educational services. Over four hundred fifty (n = 457) students or 7.9% of the eligible students used the services. This is a 46.0% increase from the previous year in which 313 students were served. Sioux Falls School District had the highest rate of participation at 38.9%, while four school districts (McLaughlin, Meade, Smee, and Shannon County) reported serving no students during the 2007-08 school year.

A total of 77 classroom teachers completed a survey regarding SES, while 18 principals completed a survey. This was a decrease in the response rate from the previous year of 54.7% from the teachers and 33.3% from the principals. Eighteen (n = 18) parents completed a survey as compared to 100 parents from the previous year. The survey asked questions about the delivery and quality of services from the provider and the participating schools.

Table 2.0 shows the number of students served by nine of the providers used by school site. **Club Z** reported the highest use by the participating students at 35.0% (n = 160). This was a significant change from the previous year in which Club Z was used by 0.86% of the students. **Campus** had the lowest use rate for 2007-08 at less than 1% (0.02%, n = 1). Sylvan Learning Center had the second highest use rate by the students at 10.7% (n = 49). The third high use rate was Academia at 9.2% (n = 42). Sioux Falls School District used the largest number of providers, 10 out of the 14 (71.4%) being reported. Nine of the 20 (45.0%) reporting schools used only one provider for the year.

<p align="center">Table 1.0 Distribution of Surveys & Reports Submitted To The South Dakota Department of Education 2007-2008</p>									
District	LEA Report	Principal Survey	Teacher Survey	Parent Survey	Number of Providers Used	Number of Eligible Students	Number of Students Receiving Services	Difference (Not Served)	Percent Served
Lake Andes	Yes	1	14	6	2	178	16	162	9.0%
Belle Fourche	Yes	1	1	4	1	108	6	102	5.6%
McLaughlin	Yes	0	0	0	0	217	0	217	0.0%
Meade	No	0	0	0	0	231	0	231	0.0%
Milbank	Yes	2	4	1	2	57	7	50	12.3%
Rapid City	Yes	1	1	1	1	1,555	16	1,539	1.0%
Sioux Falls	Yes	8	48	2	10	905	352	553	38.9%
Todd County	Yes	2	2	0	5	1,528	31	1,497	2.0%
White River	Yes	0	0	2	2	225	16	209	7.1%
Winner	Yes	1	4	0	3	112	3	109	2.7%
Smee	Yes	0	0	0	0	218	0	218	0.0%
Shannon County	Yes	1	0	0	0	210	0	210	0.0%
Watertown	Yes	1	3	2	3	214	10	204	4.7%
TOTAL	12	18	77	18	26	5,758	457	5,301	7.9%

() Number of schools reporting

Table 2.0
Distribution of Students by SES Provider
2007-2008

Schools	Academia	Babbage	Black Hills Special Services	Brainfuse	Catapult	Club Z	Cyber study	Excel Achieve Center	Failure Free Reading	Student Nest	Sylvan Learning Center	Three Rivers Coop	USF Reading & Math	Total
Andes Central Elementary	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	16
Belle Fourche Middle School	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Milbank Middle School	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	7
Rapid City Horace Mann	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Rapid City Knollwood	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Sioux Falls: LB Anderson	2	2	0	0	5	13	1	1	0	1	12	0	7	44
Sioux Falls: Cleveland Elem.	6	0	0	0	3	46	5	6	0	0	5	0	3	74
Sioux Falls: Hawthorne Elem.	13	1	0	1	14	61	6	6	0	5	17	0	7	131
Sioux Falls: Longfellow Elem.	3	2	0	0	3	12	7	3	0	2	6	0	11	49
Sioux Falls: Lowell Elem.	6	1	0	0	0	21	4	4	0	0	7	0	11	54

Table 2.0
Distribution of Students by SES Provider
2007-2008

Schools	Academia	Babbage	Black Hills Special Services	Brainfuse	Catapult	Club Z	Cyber study	Excel Achieve Center	Failure Free Reading	Student Nest	Sylvan Learning Center	Three Rivers Coop	USF Reading & Math	Total
Todd County Okreek Elem	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Todd County South Elem	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	8
Todd County Rosebud Elem	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	8
Todd County Middle	3	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Todd County High School	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Watertown High School	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	10
White River Elementary	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	5
White River Norris Elem	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
White River Middle	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	9
Winner Middle	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
TOTAL	42	8	22	9	44	160	23	20	16	13	49	12	39	457

In 2006-2007 39.8% of the students were White and 44.4% were American Indian. The most diverse student population was reported by Sioux Falls, while the majority of sites report less than two different ethnic groups (Table 3.1). Andes Central, Eagle Butte, and Shannon County reported high numbers of American Indian students due to their location on or near an Indian Reservation. In addition, 54.4% of the students (n = 130) were female and 45.6% (n = 109) were male. One in three students (34.9%) had disabilities and 30.3% of the students had Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for special education.

Table 3.1
Distribution of Students by Ethnicity
2006-2007

School District	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	White	Not Available	Total
Andes Central	0	0	0	24	7	0	31
Belle Fourche	0	1	0	0	4	1	6
Canton	0	1	0	0	15	0	16
Eagle Butte	0	0	0	6	1	0	7
Milbank	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Rapid City	0	0	0	1	6	0	7
Shannon County	0	0	0	34	0	1	35
Sioux Falls	2	22	9	8	52	0	93
Smee	0	0	0	21	2	0	23
Todd County	0	0	0	10	0	0	10
Watertown	1	0	0	0	5	0	6
White River	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Winner	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
TOTAL	3	24	9	107	96	2	241
Percent	1.2%	10.0%	3.7%	44.4%	39.8%	0.8%	100.0%

School District	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	White	Not Available	Total
Andes Central	0	0	1	16	5	0	22
Milbank	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
Rapid City	0	0	1	6	5	0	12
Sioux Falls	10	128	95	45	127	0	405
Todd County	0	1	0	17	2	0	20
Watertown	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
TOTAL	10	129	97	84	147	0	467
Percent	2.1%	27.6%	20.8%	18.0%	31.5%	0.0%	100.0%

In 2007-08, 31.5% of the students were White and 18.0% were American Indian. Almost sixty percent (59.5%) less American Indian students were served in this reporting year. Black students made up the highest percentage of the non-white students at 27.6% followed by the Hispanics at 20.8%. The most diverse student population was reported by Sioux Falls, while the majority of sites report less than three different ethnic groups (Table 3.2).

Over forty percent (43.3%, n = 202) of the students were female and 56.7% (n = 265) were male. One in four students (25.7%, n = 120) were identified as special education students and 54.8% (n = 256) of the students were identified as English Proficient Limited (LEP) students.

The Dakota STEP results were used as an annual comparison of student progress. Students in grades three through eight, and grade 11 are tested in the spring of each year. Students who are in kindergarten through second grade were not tested. Table 4.1 shows the distribution of students by their proficiency level in reading, while Table 4.2 shows the level of proficiency for mathematics for two years. The purpose of the SES is to provide additional academic support so that students will score at the proficient or advanced levels on the Dakota STEP.

Table 4.1
Number of Students' Dakota STEP Results by School District
SES Participants' Matched Reading Levels

School District	2006-07				2007-08				Level Changes		
	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	Not Tested	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	Not Tested	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below
Andes	0	9	4	9	0	14	3	5	0	5	-1
Milbank	0	2	2	0	1	2	2	0	1	0	0
Rapid City	0	4	2	0	0	5	4	5	0	1	2
Sioux Falls	7	64	55	279	12	110	64	219	5	46	9
Todd County	0	6	7	7	1	7	7	5	1	1	0
Watertown	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	3	0	-1	1
TOTAL	7	86	70	298	14	138	81	237	7	52	11
Percentage	1.5%	18.7%	15.2%	64.6%	3.0%	29.4%	17.2%	50.4%	1.5%	11.1%	2.3%

Table 4.2
Number of Students' Dakota STEP Results by School District
SES Participants' Matched Mathematics Levels

School District	2006-07				2007-08				Level Changes		
	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	Not Tested	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	Not Tested	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below
Andes	0	5	8	9	0	8	9	5	0	3	1
Milbank	0	2	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	-1	1
Rapid City	0	2	2	8	0	5	4	3	0	3	2
Sioux Falls	3	50	77	275	8	78	100	219	5	28	23
Todd County	0	5	8	7	0	7	9	5	0	2	1
Watertown	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	3	0	-1	1
TOTAL	3	65	97	302	8	99	126	235	5	34	29
Percent	0.6%	13.9%	20.8%	64.7%	1.7%	21.2%	26.9%	50.2%	1.1%	7.3%	6.2%

In Table 4.1, which shows the reading levels for SES participants, 20.2% (n = 93) of the students who received SES during the 2006-07 school year completed the Dakota STEP scored at the proficient and advanced levels in reading. In the 2007-08, 32.3% (n = 152) of the SES students scored at the proficient and advanced levels. If the 2005-06 scores are used as the pre-test scores and the 2006-07 as the post-test scores for each student, then this translates into a **59.9% improvement** over the year in the area of reading.

In 2006-07, 64.6% (n = 298) of the SES students had not been tested in reading. This was reduced to 50.4% (n = 237) in 2007-08. As a result of more students taking the DakotaStep in 2007-08, the percent of students who scored in the basic or below basic was 17.2% (n = 81). In 2006-07, the percent of students who scores in the basic or below basic was 15.2% (n = 70). In a one year period there was a 13.2% increase in the number of students in the basic or below basic levels in reading.

In Table 4.2, which shows the mathematics levels for SES participants, 14.5% (n = 68) of the students who received SES during the 2006-07 school year completed the Dakota STEP scored at the proficient and advanced levels in mathematics. In the 2007-08, 22.9% (n = 107) of the SES students scored at the proficient and advanced levels. If the 2006-07 scores are used as the pre-test scores and the 2007-08 as the post-test scores for each student, then this translates into a **57.9% improvement** over the year in the area of mathematics.

In 2006-07, 64.7% (n = 302) of the SES students had not been tested in reading. This was reduced to 50.2% (n = 235) in 2007-08. As a result of more students taking the DakotaStep in 2007-08, the percent of students who scored in the basic or below basic was 26.9% (n = 126). In 2006-07, the percent of students who scores in the basic or below basic was 20.7% (n = 97). In a one year period there was a 30.0% increase in the number of students in the basic or below basic levels in mathematics.

Table 5.1
Number of Students' Dakota STEP Results by Provider
SES Participants' Matched Reading Levels

Provider	2006-07				2007-08				Level Changes		
	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	Not Tested	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	Not Tested	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below
Academia	1	6	6	30	1	14	4	24	0	8	-2
Babbage	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	0	0
Black Hills SS	0	2	2	8	0	5	4	2	0	3	2
Brainfuse	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	-1	0
Catapult	2	23	10	12	5	26	14	2	3	3	4
Club Z	3	24	28	141	3	44	39	109	0	20	11
Cyberstudy	0	4	3	23	2	4	0	21	2	0	-3
Excel	0	2	6	16	1	4	4	12	1	2	-2
Failure Free	0	1	0	12	0	8	3	9	0	7	3
Student Nest	1	1	0	5	1	1	1	4	0	0	1
Sylvan LC	0	11	8	32	0	19	7	25	0	8	-1
USF	0	4	70	20	0	8	4	18	0	4	-66
TOTAL	7	84	134	303	13	138	81	230	6	54	-53

Table 5.2
Number of Students' Dakota STEP Results by Provider
SES Participants' Matched Mathematics Level

Provider	2006-07				2007-08				Level Changes		
	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	Not Tested	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	Not Tested	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below
Academia	1	5	7	30	1	10	8	24	0	5	1
Babbage	0	3	1	4	0	3	1	4	0	0	0
Black Hills SS	0	2	2	8	0	5	4	3	0	3	2
Brainfuse	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	-2	1
Catapult	1	18	16	12	2	22	21	2	1	4	5
Club Z	1	19	37	139	3	28	55	112	2	9	18
Cyberstudy	0	4	0	23	1	4	1	21	1	0	1
Excel	0	0	5	16	0	4	5	12	0	4	0
Failure Free	0	0	7	13	0	3	8	9	0	3	1
Student Nest	0	2	1	4	0	3	0	4	0	1	-1
Sylvan LC	0	8	12	32	1	12	13	25	1	4	1
USF	0	1	9	20	0	4	8	18	0	3	-1
TOTAL	3	65	97	301	8	99	125	234	5	34	28

Table 5.1 shows a comparison between the reading levels between 2006-07 and 2007-08 school years by service provider. There was an 85.7% ($\Delta = 6$) increase in the number of students who reached the advanced levels in reading. There was a 40.3% ($\Delta = 54$) increase in the number of students who reached the proficient level in reading. There was a 39.6% ($\Delta = 53$) decrease in the number of students who achieved the basic and below basic levels in reading. Twenty-four percent (24.1%) more students complete the DakotaStep in 2007-08. The University of Sioux Falls Mathematics & Reading Center (USF) showed the greatest number of students that moved out of the basic and below basic reading levels. This is due to the fact that in 2007-08 they worked with 68.1% less students in Sioux Falls. The difference can be accounted by the transfer of students to another program in their second year of enrollment.

Table 5.2 shows a comparison between the mathematics levels between 2006-07 and 2007-08 school years by service provider. There was doubling of the number of students who reached the advanced mathematics levels ($\Delta = 5$). There was a 52.3% ($\Delta = 34$) increase in the number of students who reached proficient levels in mathematics from the previous year. There was a 28.9% ($\Delta = 28$) increase in the number of students who reached basic or below basic levels in mathematics. Twenty-two percent (22.3%) more students completed in the DakotaStep in 2007-08.

A statistical analysis was performed to compare the performance of the 12 providers in effecting increases or decreases in students reading and mathematics levels as a result of their instructional methodologies and strategies. A single factor between subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the mean scores of the participating students for each provider. In comparing the mean differences in the reading and mathematics scores there was no significant variability between the providers at alpha 0.05 level [$F_{\text{reading}} = 0.82, p < 0.623$; $F_{\text{math}} = 0.56, p < 0.859$]. All the providers of mathematics instruction showed a mean positive gain for the students they served (Range = 1.75 to 66.33). All the providers except one, showed a mean positive gain for the students for reading instruction (Range = -13.00 to 28.86). The mean changes in scores were greatest in mathematics instruction.

Table 6.0 shows the a summary of data service reported in 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08 regarding the mean number of sessions for the reported student. The number of hours and sessions that a student participated depended on the attendance of the student, the requirements of the provider, and the location of the services. In 2007-08, students participated in an average of 20.6 sessions with minimum number of sessions being 1.0 and

the maximum of 62. Half of the students participated in more than 24 sessions. In 2006-07 the mean number of sessions was at 25.1 with a maximum number of 109 sessions.

Table 6.0 Number of Sessions Served by Providers to Students					
	Number of Students	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
2005-2006	139	22.2	1	54	23.0
2006-2007	211	25.1	1	109	21.0
2007-2008	349	20.6	1	62	24.0

Parent contact is mandatory for the SES providers. In 2005-06, parents were contacted an average of 22 times (Table 7.0). In 2006-07, the parents were contacted less at 12 times. But in 2007-08 the average of contacts per student was 4 times. Half of the 59 students' parents were contacted between 5 and 12 times during the year. Some providers reported contacting parents after each session through the use of the email or on-line services, while other providers sent reports through the mail on a monthly basis.

Table 7.0 Number of Parent Contacts					
	Number of Students	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
2005-2006	139	22.2	1	54	23.0
2006-2007	137	12.5	1	109	10.0
2007-2008	59	4.1	3	12	5.0

Table 8.0 shows the cost comparison for serving students. The average per pupil cost was \$875.20 with a median at \$1,100. The cost per hour of service was an average \$71.47 in 2007-08. In the previous year, the mean per pupil cost was \$938.20 with a median at \$927.50. This calculated to be approximately \$75.06 per hour of service.

Table 8.0 Provider Costs				
	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
2006-2007				
Per Pupil Cost	\$938.20	\$7.00	\$2,569.00	\$927.50
Cost Per Hour	\$75.06	\$7.00	\$205.52	\$60.00
2007-2008				
Per Pupil Cost	\$875.20	\$10.00	\$3,052.50	\$1,100.00
Cost Per Hour	\$71.47	\$10.00	\$373.00	\$60.00

Monitoring

The South Dakota Department of Education monitored the schools and districts for meeting the requirements for supplemental education services. In addition to the reports and surveys completed by each provider and school site, site visits were performed throughout the year to determine the level and type of services being provided. It served as opportunity to answer questions about SES and the state's reporting requirements. The following are some the highlights of the field notes from the monitoring process during the year.

Andes Elementary School

- They have contracts with *Failure Free* and *Catapult Online*.
- They have eight K-3 students) and eight 4-8 students registered with SES providers.
- They also have a contract with *Catapult Online*. They have 8 students registered (grades 4-6).
- New contact person is taking a lot of time to get everything set up, especially because ther parents are very slow in responding. She really did not understand the learning plan component this year, and was confused about the letter being sent to the homes first being approved by the DOE.

Belle Fourche Middle School

- They have a contract with *Black Hills Special Services*.
- They have 6 students (grades 5-7) registered.

-
- The principal has a 21st Century program that the parents are comfortable with, so getting the SES program up and running is difficult.
 - She also felt that there are too many instructions concerning SES procedures and there was duplication in the items to be sent in to the DOE.
 - In rural areas getting one program going, such as 21st Century, is good so there should be way to work them together for needy students.

McLaughlin – Elementary and Middle School

- Was not able to visit the school after contact them two times for a site visit.

Milbank Middle School

- They have contracts with *Sylvan Learning Center* and *Brainfuse*.
- They have 2 students (grades 6 & 8) registered with Sylvan Learning Center. They have 5 students (grades 6-7) registered with Brainfuse.
- School contact person has had good communication with Sylvan but has had slower response from Brainfuse.

Rapid City School District

- They are in a state of change, replacing the previous SES contact person.
- Basically, they do not have a contact person(s) at this time, so the building principals may be responsible without any district help or assistance. Some listed a Black Hills Special Services site coordinator as the contact person, but this is an identified provider.

General Beadle Elementary School

- The principal stated in her Monitoring Report that the school had sent the parent's letter and did some follow up. They did not receive any parental responses for SES.
- She stated that their supplemental education program is called *Discovery Centers After School Program (Black Hills Special Services)* where students can receive additional tutoring.
- She also stated that efforts are being made through the *Response to Intervention Model* (RTI) process to have parents take advantage of additional SES services.

Horace Mann Elementary

- They have a contract with *Black Hills Special Services Cooperative (Discovery Center After School Program)*. They have 10 students registered.

Knollwood Elementary:

- They have a contract with *Black Hills Special Services Cooperative (Discovery Center After School Program)*. They have 6 students registered.

Robbinsdale Elementary

- They indicated that they have no students in SES this year. Basically, they said that it was not needed because no parents requested SES.

North Middle School

- The principal said she would like some information about providers and know what to do.
- In discussion with the SES Monitor she liked the SES concept and would move on it by semester time. She was going to contact the Sylvan Learning Center and seek a site (youth center) nearby where they could offer their program.

Batesland Elementary & Red Shirt Elementary Schools

- Their report said they had no students in SES this year. No parents had request SES.
- The district contact person said they used *Tutoring Promise* last year, but it did not work, so this year no one asked for it.
- Issues were lack of supervision and poor attendance. She also feels that there is too much information which causes confusion as to what they are to do.
- They have 45 students at the Batesland Elementary School and 20 at Red Shirt Elementary School in a 21st Century after school program, in which parents are comfortable with. She feels that if the 21st Century program could work together with approved SES providers, students would participate in the extra help.

Sioux Falls School District

- The SFSD have a new administrator for federal programs this year. The District agreed with her after the SES Conference that they should have a go to person at each of the 5 SES program sites. This has made a positive difference in the numbers they have registered District-wide this fall. The LEA representative oversees the contracts and logistics with the providers.
- Some issues she has had include, provider advertising, student time and charging the District, a provider going to shifts because of numbers registered, and they could not contract with *Failure Free Learning* because of policy language not allowing a for profit business in the schools.

LB Anderson Elementary School

- They have contracts with Acadamia.net (2 students registered), Babbage (2), Catapult (5), Club Z (13), Cyberstudy 101 (1), Excel Achievement (1), Student Nest (1), Sylvan Learning (12), USF Camps (7)

Hawthorne Elementary School

- They have contracts with Acadamia.net (13), Babbage (1), Brainfuse (1), Catapult (14), Club Z (61), Cyberstudy 101 (6), Excel Achievement (6), Student Nest (5), Sylvan Learning (17), USF Camps (7)

Longfellow Elementary School

- They have contracts with Acadamia.net (3), Babbage (2), Catapult (3), Club Z (12), Cyberstudy 101 (7), Excel Achievement (3), Student Nest (2), Sylvan Learning (6), USF Camps (11)

Lowell Elementary School

- They have contracts with Acadamia.net (6), Babbage (1), Club Z (21), Cyberstudy 101 (4), Excel Achievement (4), Sylvan Learning (7), USF Camps (11)

Cleveland Elementary

- They have contracts with Acadamia.net (6), Catapult (3), Club Z (46), Cyberstudy 101 (5), Excel Achievement (6), Sylvan Learning (5), USF Camps (3)

Smee School District – Wakpala Elementary and High School

- The district report stated that they have no students registered for SES this year.
- She said they used *Failure Free Reading* last year with little success as only 3 of 13 completed it. They do not see where the rest of the six providers, who are on-line, could work for the community where most homes do not have computers or on-line capabilities. Also they are in their 8th year of their 21st Century grant and the school families have a history of fully participating in it.

Todd County School District

- The new go-to-person is Wilda Wooden Knife, who said at a meeting with the principals and central office staff that she had 5 signed provider contracts.
- One issue is that the dollars allocated are more important than the number of students to be served.
- In their experience they feel the costs charged by the providers are too high.
- They are frustrated that it takes six weeks from registration to getting a computer to the home.
- It was also mentioned that they are confused about the process for SES and asked for a clear timeline and directions to follow.
- Brainfuse refused services for 2 students because they had no computers in the home> Then said they would take one.
- They also discussed the fact that this takes a lot of time to set and they are not sure it is making a difference or there is not proof it raises STEP scores.
- A suggestion for the schools is they meet before school with the parents individually to look at all aspects of what it will take to make each student successful. SES could be brought up at the meeting.

He Dog Elementary School

- No report has been received even though it has been requested on a regular basis. They have no program this year. Last year they used *Failure Free*.

Rosebud Elementary School

- They have a contract with *Failure Free*. 8 students are registered.

Spring Creek Elementary School

- No report has been received even though it has been requested on a regular basis. They have no program this year.

South Elementary School

- They have contracts with Catapult (3 students registered), Academia.net (1) Babbage (1), Student Nest (3).

O’Kreek Elementary School

- They have a contract with Catapult (1).

Todd County Middle School

- They have contracts with Academia (3), Babbage (1), Catapult (5).

Todd County High School

- They have contracts with Academia (4), and Catapult (1).

Watertown High School

- They have contracts with Brainfuse (2) grade 9th, Club Z (6) grades 9th,10th, Student Nest (2) grade 10th

Norris Elementary School & White River Middle School

- They have contracts with Three Rivers Special Services (12), and Academia (4) grades 5th, 6th, 8th. He said was pleased that both providers have been at the school and met with the parents.
- One issue is the method of assessment and progress reporting that is used by Three Rivers Special Services. He asked for an opinion on this from the DOE.

Winner Middle School

- They have contracts with Brainfuse (1) 6th grade, Campus (1) 6th grade, Club Z (1) 5th grade.
- In discussions during the onsite the following issues were presented;
 - What is the status of Sylvia Street from Campus? She can not be contacted.
 - They would like a web address from the provider list because parents look at

the provider websites to study them.

- Even after all of the communication with parents by mail and at school most contacts happen by chance in Winner, like at the grocery store.

Principal's Questionnaire Results

There were 18 principals that responded to a survey asking questions about the supplemental educational services in their respective schools. The principals were asked how they assessed the quality of the SES provider in their respective schools (Table 9.0). The majority of the principals (82.4%) said that they used the pre and post assessment scores obtained from the instruments used by the provider and 76.5% (duplicated count) used the DakotaStep assessment scores. Less than half of the principals talked to the either the teacher or parents about a student's progress based on services received.

	n	Percent
Pre & Post assessment scores administered by the SES provider	14	82.4%
Student state assessment scores (DakotaStep)	13	76.5%
Talk with the teacher regarding student's progress	7	41.2%
Talk with the parent regarding their child's progress	6	35.3%
I do not evaluate the quality of the SES provider	1	5.9%
Other	1	5.9%

The two top ways in which principals judged success of the SES program were by improvement in the DakotaStep reading scores (47.1%) and how small group instruction was used to help students (35.3%). About one in five principals (17.6%) reported that they had not experience any success in providing supplemental services in their building. Twelve percent (11.8%) of the principals reported judging success by students improved school attendance and behavior (Table 10.0).

Table 10.0 Where Successes Have Been Experienced Principals Responses (n = 17)		
	n	Percent
Improvement in DakotaStep reading assessment scores	8	47.1%
Improvement in DakotaStep mathematics assessment scores	4	23.5%
Improvement in student's attendance in school	2	11.8%
Improvement in student's behavior	2	11.8%
Students who need the support are receiving SES	3	17.6%
SES has small group sessions	6	35.3%
I have not experience any success in providing SES	3	17.6%
Other	1	5.9%

Table 11.0 Challenges Principals Faced in Providing SES in Their Building Principals Responses (n = 17)		
	n	Percent
Communication with SES provider	4	23.5%
Students needing academic assistance are not receiving SES	6	35.3%
Capacity to monitor SES provider	4	23.5%
Capacity to monitor students involvement in SES	5	29.4%
Students not attending sessions	8	47.1%
Provider curriculum not aligned with state standards	0	0.0%
Transportation to get students to and from SES location	5	29.4%
SES provider does not provide information regarding student progress	3	17.6%
I have not faced any challenges in providing SES	1	5.9%

The principals were asked what were some of the challenges in providing SES in their school. About half of the principals (47.1%) indicated getting to students to attend SES sessions was of the biggest challenges. About one in three principals (35.3%) indicated getting academic assistance to students who needed SES. There was no explanation if this

was due to lack of parental involvement or eligibility requirements. One in four of the principals indicated that communicating or getting information from the provider was a challenge. One principal said that “parents want local access” and principals saw this as a strength for any SES provider. The principals believe it is easier to monitor students involvement and participation in SES if the provider is local. An additional challenge was transportation. About thirty percent of the principals (29.4%) indicated a need to get student to and from the SES location or site.

Teacher’s Questionnaire Results

There were 77 teachers who completed the teacher questionnaire regarding SES. The majority of the respondents taught in elementary school (83.5%, n = 71) with 11.7% (n = 10) teaching in the middle school level, grades 6 to 8, and 4.7% (n = 4) teaching in high school. Two-thirds of the teachers (65.9%, n =56) indicated that the SES provided developed and shared an individual supplemental education plan for their student. One in three teachers (34.1%) indicated that they were involved in the development of this plan or at least in identifying specific educational goals of their students with the provider.

	n	Percent
Student attendance	22	28.6%
Student participation	28	36.4%
Course work information	20	26.0%
Provider assessment scores	37	48.1%
Student behavior	15	19.5%
I did not receive any information from the provider	25	32.5%
Other	0	0.0%

Table 12.0 shows what type of information teacher’s received from the SES provider regarding their participating students. Almost half of the teachers (48.1%) reported receiving

assessment scores from the provider and one-third of the teachers (36.4%) reported receiving information about student's participation in the program. One in four teachers received information about student's attendance and course work information. About thirty percent of the teachers (32.5%, n = 25) did not receive any information from their student's SES provider.

More than one-third of the teachers (38.8%) reported being informed by their SES provider of their student's progress in the program, while the majority (57.6%) reported not being kept informed by their provider. The teachers felt that there was a communication gap and they had to rely on other sources for information about a student's progress in the SES program. There were an equal number of teachers (23.5%, n = 20) of teachers that stated the student's academic needs were being met and not being met. Some teachers expressed "being thankful for the free tutoring services received by their students" and how the individualized extra attention had helped their students. On the opposite end, there were teachers that were disappointed with the SES program. "The services did not help the students I teach." "I provided supplemental services in the classroom and was never contacted by a SES provider."

Wherever the provider kept in contact with the teacher, there were good reports. "Good program, it made a difference for my student. I saw academic growth and a more positive attitude toward school." Where the provider was not connected to the teacher, comments such as "I would like to be informed on attendance and test scores for my students."

In the previous year (2006-07), 162 teachers responded to the CAS questionnaire. One in four teachers (25.9%) reported that an individual plan for SES services was developed for each student. While 66.7% of the responding teachers did not know if a plan had been developed by the provider for the student. Fourteen percent (13.8%) of the teachers were involved in the creation of the plan. This a 147% increase from what was reported for this year's report (2007-08), when 34.1% of the teachers reported being involved in the development of their student's supplemental education plan.

Table 13.0 What kinds of information do you receive from the supplemental education service provider about the progress this student is making? Teacher Responses 2006-2007		
	n	percent
Student attendance	22	13.6%
Quiz & course work information	11	6.8%
Student behavior	11	6.8%
I do not receive any information from the provider	77	47.5%
Student participation	27	16.7%
Pre and post assessment scores	65	40.1%
Total of Respondents	162	

Almost half of the teachers (47.5%) reported not getting any feedback from the providers regarding their students (Table 13.0). Those who did get feedback, received information regarding pre and post assessment scores (40.1%), student participation (16.7%), and attendance (13.6%). Some of teachers reported “not being aware of any services being provided to their students.” “I have no way of knowing my student’s progress. There is no feedback.”

Since many of the teachers reported getting feedback from the SES provider, 137 teachers (84.5%) could only based their student’s progress from either direct observation or SES reports. Table 14.1 shows that one in four students (28.5%) have made very much academic progress, while 43.8% of teachers reported that their students had made little progress. Table 14.2 shows how the teachers were able to ascertain the level of progressed achieved. The majority of the teachers (60.6%) used marking period grades while 46.7% used student’s motivation in the classroom.

Table 14.1 Based on your own observations and classroom assessment please describe the extent to which this student has made progress. Teacher Responses 2006-2007		
	n	percent
The student's academic performance has regressed.	4	2.9%
The student's academic performance has stayed about the same as when the services started	34	24.8%
The student's academic performance has made little progress	60	43.8%
The student's academic performance has made very much progress	39	28.5%
Total	137	100.0%

Table 14.2 How did you determine if the student made progress? Teacher Responses (n = 137) 2006-07		
	n	percent
Provider pre and post assessment	32	23.4%
The students' motivation in your classroom	64	46.7%
The students' attendance in your classroom	15	10.9%
The students' state assessment scores	6	4.4%
The students' marking period grades	83	60.6%
Other	25	18.2%

Parent Questionnaire Results

Seventeen parents responded to a survey regarding SES received by their child. When the parents were asked how they made their decision regarding the selection of a SES provider, 17.6% (n = 3) said the principal helped them. One third of the parents (35.3%) said that their child's teacher help them in selected a SES provider, while 23.5% (n = 4) made the decision on their own.

When asked how their received information about their child's progress in SES, 35.2% (n = 6) said they received it in person, while 41.2% (n = 7) received a progress report in the mail. About thirty percent (29.4%) received a progress report monthly, 11.8% (n =2) received before and after each completed session, and 11.8% did not get any information.

	n	Percent
Catapault	3	17.6%
Club Z	2	11.8%
Discovery	3	17.6%
Excel Achievement	0	0.0%
Failure Free	3	17.6%
Brainfuse	2	11.8%
Three Rivers Special Services	3	17.6%
Student Nest	1	5.9%

Table 16.0 What type of information do you receive from your child's SES provider? (n = 18)		
	n	Percent
Student attendance	5	27.8%
Student participation	6	33.3%
Student behavior	4	22.2%
Quiz and course work information	5	27.8%
Pre & post assessment scores	8	44.4%
I do not receive any information	3	16.7%

The majority of the parents received information about their child's pre and post assessment scores (44.4%). About one in three parents receive information regarding their child's attendance (27.8%), participation (33.3%) and course work information (27.8%). About one in five parents reported not receiving any information (16.7%).

Table 17.0 How satisfied are you with the quality of service your child has been receiving from the service provider listed above?				
	2006-07		2007-08	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
Very satisfied	41	45.6%	4	23.5%
Satisfied	40	44.4%	6	35.3%
Dissatisfied or No Information	7	7.8%	7	41.2%
Very dissatisfied	2	2.2%	0	0.0%
Total	90	100.0%	17	100.0%

One in four parents (23.5%) were very satisfied and 35.3% were satisfied with the quality of instruction being provided by the SES tutors. When asked about the size of the SES class, 29.4% were very satisfied and 35.3% were satisfied. Two-thirds of the parents

(64.7%) were very satisfied or satisfied with the quality of services being made available to their child. When asked how this has impacted their child's performance, 23.5% has noted a lot of improvement for their child. While 41.2% has noted little or no progress for their child.

Conclusion

The South Dakota Department of Education commissioned the evaluation of the Supplemental Education Services providers for the 2007-2008 school year. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine:

1. Do the schools and school district in Level II school improvement provide parents the opportunity to enroll their children in supplemental education services?
2. Are supplemental education service providers implementing their programs in the South Dakota schools and districts?
3. How effective are the supplemental education services in South Dakota schools and districts?

Information about the quality and satisfaction with SES providers was obtain through reports and questions sent to the South Dakota Department of Education by administrators, teachers, and parents. The response rate from all three data sources was low and therefore the statistical power was low for this evaluation report. Although, the effect size was low, the information was still valuable in determining the impact of the SES providers in 42 schools located in 12 school districts.

Another data source was the monitoring process. Interviews and site visits with students, parents, school personnel, and SES providers were conducted in 26 eligible school sites. The results showed that many of the respondents were satisfied with the programming that had been occurring, but there were still a significant number that had concerns with provider feedback and accountability. The monitor reported that schools and providers were actively involved in recruiting eligible students into a SES program.

Data was collected through the Department of Education regarding the demographics of students served, assessment data, and service data. The names of students who received services were submitted by the school districts directly to the state. The number of students did not match with the number of students that the service providers reported. The state had documentation and completed records for 457 students served by SES providers for 2007-08 school year.

Dakota STEP data was analyzed by provider and school district for the participating students. Results from the spring 2007 and spring 2008 Dakota STEP were compiled and statistical tests showed that there were statistically significant differences in the standard scores from 2007 to 2008 in the area of reading (59.9% of the students improved) and in the area of mathematics (57.9% of the students improved). Each provider used their own assessment to conduct pre and post tests. However, the data was unable to be used as there was no standard for scoring established across all service providers.

Recommendations

Based on the findings in this report, the external evaluator is proposing the following recommendations to be considered for the 2007-2008 school year:

- Expand the monitoring process to **all** schools, parents, students, and SES providers to ensure a broader evaluation.
- Need to get provider reports and feedback regarding student performance, types of measures being used, communication (reporting) schedules, and tutor questionnaires.
- Identify a set of reading and mathematics standardized assessment tools that all providers can use to measure academic progress for their respective delivery modality. This will provide a consistent pre and post testing data comparative analysis of academic progress. Currently, only the Dakota STEP can be used to validate any progress.
- In order to maintain an accurate data base of students receiving services, supplemental education service providers should submit their rosters and enrollment directly to the Department of Education on monthly reporting cycle.
- More parents and teachers should be recruited to complete the CAS questionnaires. Additionally, all providers and LEAs offering SES should be required to complete the CAS.
- The external evaluator should review annually the data collection systems, questionnaires, and surveys in collaboration with the South Dakota Department of Education, monitors, and other stakeholders.